DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 352 FL 001 378

By-Rexine, John E., And Others

Latin and/or the Classics--Which Will Have the Emphasis?: A Symposium.

Canisius Coll., Buffalo, N.Y.
Pub Date 69
Note-10p., Four opinions given at a meeting of the Classical Association of Western New York, Mount St. Joseph's Academy, Buffalo, New York, September 28, 1968
Journal Cit-Canisius College Language Methods Newsletter; v6 n2 p1-10 Spring 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60
Descriptors-*Classical Languages, Classical Literature, College Curriculum, Cultural Awareness, *Curriculum Evaluation, Curriculum Planning, Curriculum Problems, *Educational Change, Educational Trends, Greek, High School Curriculum, *Instructional Innovation, Integrated Curriculum, Interdisciplinary Approach, *Language Learning Levels, Latin, Student Interests, Student Needs

Classical language studies must not be deleted from modern high school and college curriculums despite the current concern over decreasing enrollments. In an attempt to find a solution to the unfavorable enrollment trend, Dr. John Rexine counselled the integration of classical studies into a more socially-oriented curriculum stressing satisfaction of new student concerns for individual development and subject matter relevance. In describing the ability of classical studies to absorb new trends and styles in education, Dr. George Kustas suggested increasing the awareness of classical cultures without exposing students to classical languages. Rev. John Ryan advocated Latin in translation both for those who will and will not pursue a long study sequence in order to extend literary experiences. And Dr. Frank Stockin suggested bringing Latin out of curricular isolation. (AF)

From: Canisius College Language Methods Newsletter, Volume VI, Number 2, Spring 1969.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED030352

LATIN AND/OR THE CLASSICS - WHICH WILL HAVE THE EMPHASIS?

A Symposium

Following are four opinions expressed by experts on college or high school level regarding the place of Latin and/or the Classics in today's curriculum.

The four opinions were given for a meeting of the Classical Association of Western New York on Saturday, September 28, 1968, at Mount St. Joseph's Academy in Buffalo, New York.

The participants included: Dr. John E. Rexine, Professor and Chairman, Classics Department of Colgate University, Hamilton, New York; Dr. George L. Kustas, Chairman, Department of Classics, State University of New York at Buffalo; Rev. John Ryan, Head, Latin Department at Bishop Turner High School, Buffalo; and Dr. Frank Gordon Stockin, Professor of Classics and Chairman of the Division of Foreign Languages at Houghton College, Houghton, New York.

The decrease in Latin enrollments has long been a growing concern of Classics teachers throughout the nation. It is hoped that a start of a solution to this problem may be found in the following opinions.

1. Dr. John E. Rexine

There is a crisis, not to say a rebellion, in American education today and this rebellion has taken place within the context of American society and the moral, social, political and economic problems that American society must cope with and solve satisfactorily if it is to survive as a viable representative of the twentieth century. Students have seen or think they have seen a shattering or betrayal of the American dream, corruption and decadence in the traditional institutions (including the schools which are especially vulnerable and where they expected the teaching and practice of virtue, the presence of trust, love, freedom, and truth). Respect for authority and toleration of authoritarianism have been remarkably limited and often lacking. Resort to disruption, violence, and illegal actions of one sort or another is becoming a regular phenomenon. Though students now tend to reject the paternalism of the past and the principle of loco parentis, they demand a more intimate relation with their teachers and protest the submergence of their individualism in the massification of modern society. Negativism, nihilism, and anarchy often characterize students' actions and philosophy and equality with teachers, administrators and even trustees is demanded even before maturity, understanding or wisdom have been achieved. Individualism and relevance are the battle-cries of today's students and anyone in education who ignores their strident voices does so at the risk of becoming himself obsolete and irrelevant. Administrators are running scared and students have discovered that they do have power that they never dreamed they could have because administrative structures have been shown to have been built on sand and housed in buildings of paper. The classics in times like these will easily suffer the charge that they are not only irrelevant but useless in solving the kinds of activist issues that are wracking and wrecking American life and complacency and the education which the valedictorians used to proclaim prepared students for life has been found guilty of preparing them neque scholae neque vitae.

FL 001 378

Sociology was unknown to the ancients and the monolingual ethnocentrism of American students is no place more clearly manifest than in their choice of courses in so-called "Free University" programs where burning social, political and economic issues are the order of the day. There is obviously a revolution in American eduation and, like it or not, sooner or later, all levels and all aspects of education will be affected. The very structure of the educational system (from classroom instruction, laboratories, grades, and examinations to the traditional teacher-student relation) is being called into question and put on trial. The Socratic dictum, so long taught and so little heeded, that the unexamined life is not worth living, is being taken seriously and applied to everything. The gadflies have multiplied to the point that the horses are not only seriously troubled but kicking vigorously. The scientific and technological revolution has been followed by a social revolution, the outcome of which remains to be seen. Modern industrial society is characterized by all kinds of changes, some of them violent in nature but all done in the name of progress and a better world.

Where do the Classics or Latin fit in a world of this sort? To be more to the point, do the Classics have any place in American education or are they merely an arcane subject for study by specialists whose erudition may be great but whose impact on American education is negligible, if not nil? A distinguished classicist, Gerald Else, at a national meeting now known as the Airlie House Conference, made it abundantly clear when he stated to those in attendance that "The Classics have ceased to exert any appreciable influence on our national or corporate life. They are of concern to a small fraction of the population in school and college; and to almost no one outside academic walls." Though such a statement may seem grossly exaggerated to classicists, the truth is that the classics are no longer the main core of American education nor of American interest.

Simply in terms of bodies, less than 45 universities in the United States offer programs leading to the Ph.D. in the Classics and only ten of these are considered of the first rank. The total number of Ph.D.'s awarded in 1964 was 49. In 1964, 15,000 Ph.D.'s were given in the United States.

In 1964, 1,658 students (undergraduate) majored in the classics out of roughly 618,000; 288 received Master's degrees. One estimate places the number of students currently pursuing postgraduate work in classics at 500. The numbers clearly indicate the very limited place quantitatively that the classics hold in American higher education.

In the schools the situation is not one to be elated about. Reports indicate that in 1959 there were 618,000 enrollments in Latin in public high schools as compared to 480,000 in French and 691,000 in Spanish. In 1964 the number of Latin students jumped to 680,000 but the French number leaped to 1,131,000 and Spanish to 1,336,000. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a significant factor in the promotion of the learning and the teaching of modern foreign languages. The figures for 1965-1966 indicate a drop in Latin enrollments from 19.5% to 14%. There is no way of predicting at this point that the tide will be stemmed. Some new, creative approaches must be launched vigorously and very soon. The Airlie House Conference, the Oxford Conference, and The Report of the Colloquium in the Classics in Education are clear indications that the profession is at long last beginning to recognize that there is a problem. An immense amount of work needs to be done but there is still no effective national organization.

There are at least two interests that characterize the demands of today's student: (1) the need for self-development, for fulfillment of the individual as an individual and (2) the insistence that subject matter be made relevant to today's world, with the student claiming that he should have the right to determine what his education will be since it is his life that is being molded. How do the Classics and/or Latin fit into all this?

It becomes obvious then that mere language study for a short period of time is of practically no value in terms of today's demands. The stress must be elsewhere, if there is to be anything classical to survive or to be utilized in America's educational program. The "New Classics" cannot simply be a course in language though, it must be an integrated program based firmly on the Greek and Latin languages. Ideally the language aspect should be mastered in school, certainly in high school and preferably begun in junior high school or even earlier. Elementary language courses in college in the traditionally taught languages (Latin, French, Spanish, German) should become an extinct phenomena. By the time students reach the college level they should be reading real Latin authors with some ease and considerable interest. As it is, most students take Latin because of a language requirement or some other utilitarian reason, not for its own sake. What apparently has not been applied and appreciated by the students in the schools is a humanistic approach. Dr. Nevitt Sanford of Stanford University's Institute for the Study of Human Problems in his latest student-oriented book Where Colleges Fail urges a return to humanism and insists that college must deal with students as human beings, as individuals, whose personalities are what colleges should be developing. Self-examination and individual development must be a final goal of a true liberal arts education. Professional or specialized education too early stifles and limits the full development of the individual and frustrates educating the whole man. One study is cited (p.99) which indicates that "intensive study of Greek civilization may be as good for freshmen as the study of five elementary courses in as many different fields." Coming from a social psychologist, this citation should be clear indication that the classics in the right form can be a positive part of a college student's program but language study by itself has failed and will continue to fail to attract large numbers of students unless it is placed in its proper cultural and educational framework. The classics in education as a legitimate field for human development would not only be classical historically (cf. Homeric arete) but would command attention and respect as a powerful force in education. It would be difficult to provide a detailed outline of what should be done but certain general outlines seem clear. Classical civilization (both Greek and Latin), archaeology, art, ancient science, philosophy, mythology, history (with much more made of Hellenic and Roman influences in African and Asiatic lands), religion, need to be integrated into a program that relates to areas and institutions that are of interest and value in today's world. Not only classics but every subject in the curriculum will be called upon to justify to the student why he should become involved in subjects that don't matter. If classicists are the true heirs of classical humanism, they will show their colleagues and their students that Greece and Rome do matter. To use Gerald Else's words, "Our situation - our dilemma - is that the role of the classics in present-day American life is almost nil, while their relevance is enormous." Else is surely right when he suggests that classical education was a source of (1) political, (2) ethical, and (3) aesthetic training. "...It was an education for public responsibility and

private grace; its highest purpose was political and moral." Surely, Professor Else is on the right track.

I have no program to propose at this time but I do feel that serious consideration must be given to programs that will integrate the classical languages into more socially-oriented curricula that will capitalize upon the literary, historical, political, artistic, and scientific experience of the ancients. After all, the modern sociologist, psychologist, and political activist have no monopoly on the study of man and the classics have a real contribution to make, if that contribution is made in meaningful educational terms.

2. Dr. George L. Kustas

The problem raised by the question, "Latin and/or the Classics?" is not one that affects the high school alone. It is very much in the air in colleges and universities and, I might add, forms a topic of discussion and deep concern at the State University in Buffalo at the present time. That is why I welcome the opportunity to address you, for your invitation has given me the chance to reflect more carefully and try to sort out some of my thoughts on the subject.

By "Classics" I take it we mean the broader definition of ancient culture to include a number of disciplines, rather than the study of that culture primarily or exclusively through the resources of Latin as a language and a literature. Let us assume that we are all in favor of both, Latin and the Classics. It would be a mistake to choose, for Latin is part of Classics and Classics part of Latin, and so it shall ever be. Hence, the problem is to look at the ways they might reinforce each other in the curriculum.

The study of the ancient world is the study par excellence of something more than we normally include in the word "humanities." More properly it is an area study and as such includes a number of disciplines from the social as well as physical sciences: linguistics, history, anthropology, as well as the study of physical remains through archaeological techniques. Whether we teach exclusively the grammar and vocabulary of a language, that language study is constantly being reinforced by a set of disciplines which in the Renaissance and up through the nineteenth century were themselves limbs from a parent tree. No one thought to give a name to the set as a whole because what we call Classics was education itself. As these offshoots developed in their own right, that is to say, as the various -ologies that make up our educational patterns came into their own, they began to challenge not only the unity but the very existence of the parent stock. In our lifetime these challenges have come from primarily three quarters.

During World War II, when I was an undergraduate, linguistics was a newcomer to most campuses. It profited in part from the demand of government that students be taught a foreign language in the most efficient way possible so that we could assume our global role as a nation more responsibly. In the process, modern language departments were uprooted and often deflected from their humanistic concerns and asked to become instruments of language study alone. Many have never recovered, though it is pleasing to note that in the past few years a more judicious balance has been struck. Classics was better able to withstand the shock, for it enjoyed a greater resiliency through

being from the start more catholic, more inter-disciplinary, or rather multi-disciplinary, in its nature. In the process it could, ideally speaking, receive the best that linguistic research was discovering with the least disruption of its humanistic function. One might even say that classical linguistics itself, the analysis of the Greek and Latin languages, was measurably enhanced, since it continued being regarded as an integral portion of the general humanistic pursuit that is Classics itself.

A second challenge arose through the declining interest in the humanities and the elevation of the sciences and social sciences to command more and more of the curriculum and a greater share of the educator's attention in both high schools and colleges. In an effort to give an ever busier world a taste of culture, in contrast to the time when Greek and Latin were requirement for graduation, Great Books courses, symposia, and colloquia, arising often out of English studies, appeared on the scene. The beginning of this phenomenon antedates the war, but its greatest period of growth follows it. Many of these great books were necessarily classical books. At worst, such courses of study offered a quick, pre-packaged exposure to some of the world's great literature; at best, they carried the liberal arts to a wider public and did so under the wholesome inspiration of a synthesizing approach. Once again the core of Classics, Greek and Latin letters, remained fast, at the same time that it was able to expand its horizons and its influence by being conceived as part of a larger canvas which pictured the achievements of ancient thought and related it to modern questions. Great Books techniques are now on the wane. Not the least of their service has been the introduction of the methods of literary criticism into classical learning. Our cause has on the whole, I think, been well served by them.

A third challenge or contribution also comes from English studies though it has in recent years taken on more and more of an independent cast. As departments of English have widened their interest and become departments of literature generally, they have helped give birth to courses of study in Comparative Literature. Those of us who have been teaching Cicero are told that we should be teaching him differently, that the important thing is not Cicero but Cicero <u>and</u> somebody (or even something) else, that we are better off teaching not just Virgil but Virgil in relation to Milton. This demand, too, I think we should welcome, though I find myself sometimes wishing it were put with more courtesy. We cannot afford to deny ourselves the privilege of these new insights as well. C.S. Lewis has the Devil in the <u>Screwtape Letters</u> instruct his earthly agent that one of the best way to undermine Christianity is to get people talking about Christianity <u>and</u> something else: "You know, Christianity and the Crisis, Christianity and the New Psychology, Christianity and Spelling Reform." The danger is real, but it can be surmounted. Properly treated, Comparative Literature, like linguistics, can add to our knowledge of ourselves and far from undermining the classics can help insure its survival.

What I am getting at is this: more than any other subject in the curriculum, our discipline has traditionally been able to receive unto itself and spin off from itself a rich variety of new forms. We have more than others the capacity for self-renewal through the adoption of new ways and means of understanding our heritage. And we can do this in a special way for we represent education itself and can instinctively react to historical need. The very emergence and success of the new forms bespeaks the vitality not

only of the children but, mark it well, of the mother herself. I do not wish to seem Pollyannish, but I do admit to a degree of optimism about our future.

How does one go about insuring the health of Classics/Latin in our schools and its relevance to the modern world? The trick here is to continue instruction in the fundamentals of Latin - under no circumstances must this be sacrificed - while we work at the same time toward increasing the awareness of classical culture among our Latinless students in other areas as well as among those engaged in the study of Latin itself. You yourselves know more how to go about such a task than I do. It would be presumptuous on my part to tell you how to include more ancient history in the world history surveys or in general how to bring in more classical examples in the text books used for social studies, for art history, and for science. It is you who know how to add more classical paperbacks to the high school library, how and when to offer palatable extra-curricular or semi-curricular programs involving basically not language learning but appreciation of the achievement of Greece and Rome. I can only insist that it be done, not only to preserve the integrity of the teaching of Latin itself but to meet our wider responsibility of exposing as many students as possible to an understanding of the meaning and importance of ancient life. If we do not do it, others, rest assured, will do it for us and will do it less well. I am regularly appalled at the interpretation of the Classics supplied by instructors in other areas who have no training in Latin or Greek. It is not enough to protest or suppress their ignorance; we must work to overcome it.

In the Latin instruction itself it should be possible to alter the readings in our textbooks so as to include a much greater selection of passages illustrative not so much of a great author - a Caesar, a Cicero, or a Virgil, important though they are - but illustrative of antiquity itself. One could without too much effort, I think, compose readers of various levels of difficulty which would contain quotations from a variety of authors telling us what the Romans thought or did in art and architecture, their attitude toward politics, toward religion, their philosophical interests, and a host of other topics, interestingly presented, on matters of common concern throughout the history of the West. What I am asking is admittedly a new departure - though some models exist already in British schools:- it requires new textbooks and scholars to write them and it supposes that Albany might have the vision to adopt them. But if it were done, we might perhaps both have our cake and eat it, too: keep our Latin instruction intact while at the same time we spread the gospel of the Classics and guarantee not merely its survival but survival with increased vigor through increased relevance to the broader business of a liberal education.

3. Rev. John Ryan

When I was a senior in high school, in the academic year 1946-47, my English teacher explained to our class a program which was to be introduced in the Liberal Arts Division of Manhattan College. I have forgotten most of the details of this program but the guiding principle made quite an impression on me then and has stayed with me ever since: Western civilization is built upon a twin foundation - the Judeo-Christian religious tradition and the cultures of Greece and Rome. The cold war had the world in its icy grip by that time

and in spite of occasional thawings is our major preoccupation today. Western civilization is under attack and everything that we value is challenged. In the last few years, a second front has opened up in this war - an attack is being made upon our culture by those who were intended to be its heirs, the disillusioned youth of the Western world. We cherish our culture for ourselves and we long to pass it on to friendly and receptive hands. How can we do this, under such adverse conditions? I think that we must first provide the widest possible dissemination of our philosophy in its complete historical perspective. We cannot expect what is not known to be appreciated. This brings me to the point of this morning's discussion: should Latin be taught "as Latin" or "in translation"?

Most of us are secondary school teachers. Those who are not realize that for most students the study of Latin must begin on the secondary school level, if not before, or it will never begin at all. What is happening at the secondary school level? The pressure of technological competition has effected our curriculum. Our better students are encouraged by guidance counselors to follow a course of studies which will prepare them for science and engineering programs. The ever-increasing demands of the State Education Department for courses in citizenship, health, driver education, and other useful, but non-academic courses fill up the balance of the students' schedules. We must face the fact that the majority of our students will not take any Latin courses. If this majority is to have any contact with our Greco-Roman patrimony they must get it "in translation" and it must be worked into their English and social studies courses. I feel that our first task as cultural partisans must be to see that this is done.

There will still be some students, however, who can be directed into a sequence of Latin courses. What should we offer them? Surely, they can be given an uncompromising, undiluted program. They are already convinced of the value of what they are doing or they would not be following such a program. Perhaps. But we must face the fact that we live in an age of fiercely competitive salesmanship. The value of what they are doing must constantly be proven to them. They must see the goal clearly from the very beginning. As a clergyman in today's doubting world let me assure you that no young person takes anything on faith anymore. Before they have had time to develop the skill to read the great Latin authors "in Latin", they must become acquainted with them and be inspired by them or they will never persevere. This means that there must be some Latin "in translation." Even students who have had two or three years of Latin still need the help of Latin "in translation." I teach Vergil to a class of eleventh-grade students. When they come to me, they have had two years of Latin. A good part of their second year was influenced by the necessity to prepare for the Regents examination. Before they can begin to work on the Aeneid, there is quite a bit of introductory work to be done. When this is finished and we actually start to work on the epic itself, the most we can hope to accomplish is a rate of twenty to thirty lines per class. Obviously, we will not finish the work. The New York State syllabus recognizes this "fact of life" by assigning only Books I, II, IV, and VI. What of this author's other works, for purposes of comparison? What of other types of poetry, other authors? We waited until college for this wider view. I don't think today's high school students will. They don't wait for this depth and richness of experience in their other courses. Why should Latin be different? I want my students to have seen the Aeneid as a

whole, as its author intended it to be seen, before they start to translate. I want them to see the wider picture of Latin poetry, of which the Aeneid is only a part, however distinguished and pre-eminent. When I first started to teach Vergil, it was to twelfth graders. I had the justifiable fear that this would be their last year of Latin and I wanted them to have the pleasure of contact with other authors which I had enjoyed in college. I sacrificed a quarter of a year of Vergil for the study of other poets. As a result, three of the twenty-one became interested enough to choose Classical studies as their major concentration in college and two are continuing their work at the graduate level. They have assured me that the wider view which I tried to give them was instrumental in their choice.

Having said so much in favor of translation, let me now seemingly reverse myself and say that I actually side with those who advocate Latin "in Latin"! If the students of today do not learn Latin, there will be no scholars of tomorrow to translate this great heritage for the rest of us. What I advocate is a realistic "coming to grips" with our present academic situation. For those who will not take Latin, let there be at least some exposure in translation. For those who will study the language, let them enjoy the support which translation can give. This solution is hardly revolutionary, it may not be as honest or pure as might be desired. But, I think it is practical.

4. Dr. Frank Gordon Stockin

The English poet, Lord Tennyson, the author of those immortal verses on Vergil in commemoration of the Roman poet's 1900th anniversary, also authored these words: "Our little systems have their day," and elsewhere, "The old order changeth yielding place to new." Either or both of these quotes would seem pertinent in some measure to the issue before us this morning. I am not speaking for my colleagues but for myself when I say that I scarcely know how to take hold on this problem. What do you say to one who asks you how to pick up an octopus?

Dr. Annette H. Eaton, president of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, records that this association is "looking toward a larger role for itself in the struggle to reverse the downward trend of Latin enrollment in its region." And she goes on to add (CW, September 1968) that "too many people working in the field of Classics have drifted into the American pattern of looking toward some super-organization to save them, or with studied indifference asking what one individual can do in such a crisis."

At odd moments of late I have taken a random glance back through the years of Classical Journal and Classical World, and have noted again and again the efforts of one and another to infuse strength into the battlements of the traditional classical studies in the face of threatening forces. In fact, I wonder if there ever was a time when the serious-minded with a Latin orientation were not forcing apologetics for classical studies. Perhaps worthwhile matters are always in need of cogent propaganda. In the opening sections of the Satyricon of Petronius of the 60's A.D., these words arrest our attention: "Nam nisi dixerint quae adolescentuli probent, soli in scholis relinquentur." May I freely render them as follows: "If you teachers don't please us, we'll stage a walk-out!" And in that same area of the Satyricon we read also a thought voiced all too frequently in our times: "Nunc pueri in scholis ludunt."

These words reflect an academic situation in the early part of the first century A.D., whatever degree of satire they may represent. To be sure, the question was not one of Latin versus no-Latin or no-Classics, but the benefits - cultural and otherwise - of formal education were under a challenge for survival.

The tide rises and falls. Good signs and bad ones do succeed intermittently, and when the bad sign is in the ascendancy, it is only natural for conservative minds to feel alarm about the impending future. A cross section of our state of New York at this moment would undoubtedly reveal encouragingly good trends in our Latin enrollments and, at the same time, some direful statistics on the Latin cause. Many factors are playing into this situation and cannot be delineated at this time. Many schools are just getting under way this month and registration facts are not yet established, so I can speak intelligently only for my own campus situation in terms of enrollment figures. As of yesterday, a quick check around my staff revealed enrollments in the Beginning courses in the languages as follows: French - 25, Spanish - 50, Latin - 62, Greek - 71, German - 90, and Hebrew - 5. In the level of Intermediate Latin (2 yrs. of high school or one yr. of college Latin) there are 52. There are 4 advanced Classics courses for which I do not yet have the facts. To meet the demand in Classics we have hired a second full-time professor. There are 3 sections of Beginning Greek and one section of Beginning Latin. Among our seniors out practice-teaching at this time in the secondary school levels, we have 2 in Spanish, 2 in French, 1 in German, and 3 in Latin. To be sure, this is not a great statistic but an encouraging one from a comparative viewpoint. From the outlook on our campus of recent years, the problems besetting the Classics have been almost negligible compared to those in the modern languages, where the paramount problem has been the securing of an adequately qualified staff. Perhaps our question and answer period later will bear on this point and provide some helpful directives.

Returning to the theme of our panel, may I say that I find it difficult to become informed about the exact current position of Latin. Pertinent knowledge here tends directly to influence my sentiment about degrees of emphasis. Upon returning from an annual meeting of CAES or from a Latin Teachers Workshop (page the enjoyable workshop at St. Bonaventure this last August), I have the feeling that the opponents of our cause are going to perish like the armies of Sennacherib. However, when I get the hinterland reports from individuals who say, "After my retirement Latin is being dropped," or "Next year I'll be teaching English only," or "Do you know what the State Department is thinking now?" in tones that suggest disaster--then I tend to reflect, "Well, just another term or so and I'll be looking into unemployment benefits!" And so it goes...some of you well know what I mean.

About the middle of this month I had a communication exchange with Professor Gerald Else of the University of Michigan. Let me quote a comment from his letter:

> "I may be unduly pessimistic, but I think that traditional Latin, taught in the traditional way, and presented for the traditional reasons, is in for more trouble still in the future."

I shall argue neither for or against this statement at the moment but would note that some might reasonably ask for clarification detail on the term <u>traditional</u>.

I believe that Professor Else and others maintain that one reason, in particular, for the precarious position of Latin now is its increasing isolation in the curriculum. It does not have effective rapport with any other field as do the modern foreign languages, English, history, or social studies, for example. This attitude I am not able to assess for lack of specific illustration. We ought to have general discussion on this rapport-item following our panel presentations. It is the view of Professor Else that this problem of increasing isolation and effective rapport must be solved by developing a close working affiliation between the high school Classics and the new humanities programs. This, of course, would answer our title question; the emphasis would be on the Classics in terms of their content and relevance. Supporting further this need for affiliation is the fact, very keenly argued by some, that the modern conditions in our land make the political and moral experience of the classical peoples (note plural) even more important to our students than the linguistic discipline that can come from Latin study. I suppress comment on this view, awaiting floor discussion after our panel. It is healthy for us to examine charity and to remember that either emphasis can work salutary results. Mary E. Norton of The George Washington University, in an informative article on Classics in Translation (CW, April 1968) writes:

> "I've never been very good in Latin," said one youth realistically, "but it's introduced me to the Aeneid, and now I want to read it in English." A number of others who have never studied the original languages are becoming converts to the classics through "classics in translation" courses, which often motivate, in turn, the study of Latin or Greek.

Finally, you will ask what is my personal position on the issue. Briefly stated, it is a pro-Latin emphasis with a judicious adjustment to a limited incorporation of the humanities emphasis, or however we should define it. To this statement you will reply that it is vague and compromising, adding, perhaps, other uncharitable adjectives. Accordingly, let me present my credo in more ample phrases:

1) I do not want to be guilty of a closed mind; that is unclassical.
2) I shall not succumb to a suggested program of humanities devoid of some direct study of Latin and/or Greek.
3) I shall be elastic enough to adapt my lower division college courses in Greek and Latin to welcome the high school graduates who have the Shakespeare credentials of "little Latin and less Greek."
4) I shall never accept the position that while Classics in Translation are good and certainly better than none, they are a substitute for the direct study of the Classics. The ultimate in spirit cannot be translated. Here I call to witness the sundry versions of Homer's poetry, or just a single line from the Satyricon: nunc etiam languori tuo gratias ago, which line the writer Landor thought the most beautiful sentence in the Latin language.
5) So often we say and hear: Literature is life. Yes, and nothing so expresses a people's life as does their language. So, in my opinion, translated literature only, to use a Biblical phraseology, will be Roman or Greek life seen through a glass darkly.